Oliver

THE LATTER-DAY SAINTS'

MILLENNIAL STAR.

"AND THEY THAT BE WISE SHALL SHINE AS THE BRIGHTNESS OF THE FIRMAMENT AND THEY THAT TURN MANY TO RIGHTEOUSNESS AS THE STARS FOR EVER AND EVER."—*Daniel.*

No. 5, Vol. XXXVIII. Monday, January 31, 1876. Price One Penny.

MARRIAGE AND THE CONSTITUTION.

Deseret Evening News, Dec. 22, 1875.

In the charge of Chief Justice White, in the Third District Court in this city, to the jury in the case of the U. S. *vs.* George Reynolds, recently delivered, his honor expounds the law and the Constitution in reference to a plurality of wives. In our opinion the learned gentleman does not grasp the question with the broad comprehensiveness, nor present it to the jury with the unclouded perspicuity, which the importance of the subject demands. To some people of limited views the question appears definite, and they narrowly and hastily decide that all plural marriages are crimes, and should be punished by law. To others the question is involved in a large amount of obscurity and doubt, and they are unable to see plainly what steps should be taken in the matter, what steps Congress should take, or whether or not that body has any right to take any steps whatever in regard to it. There is again a third class, who comprehend the whole question more thoroughly, see it in its various aspects with an approximation towards perfect clearness, and consequently are fully assured that Congress has no constitutional right to interfere in the matter of "Mormon" plural marriages, has nothing whatever to do with the subject.

To our view, and judging by his charge in the case mentioned, the Chief Justice belongs to the first named class. In our opinion his charge does very scant justice to the subject. It is too superficial in regard to the question of the constitutionality of the law against plurality of wives, and to the right of Congress to make a law forbidding plural marriages in Utah, and providing punishment for men who marry more than one wife. For our part we are perfectly satisfied that the law of 1862, under which this prosecution of Mr. Reynolds was based, is plainly and flatly unconstitutional, that it ought to be so adjudged in every case of the kind. This we will proceed to demonstrate beyond rational controversy, first stating, by the way, that the law of 1862 was for the prevention and punishment of polygamy, but the Revised Statutes speak of the offence simply as bigamy.

The fundamental principle of the Federal Union is civil and religious liberty—as to civil liberty, the right of the people to self-government, to a government of, and by, and for, the people; and as to religious liberty, the right of every man to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience. This has always been proudly held forth as the distinguishing characteristic of the government of the United States, as its great superiority over the monarchies, empires and despotisms of the old world, and every other form of government than this upon the globe.

The Declaration of Independence states, as self-evident truths, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that governments are instituted to secure these rights, and derive their just powers from the consent of the governed; that the people have a right to institute or change governments, so that they may be founded on such principles and organized in such form as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness. Under these fundamental doctrines, or "self-evident truths," the United Colonies proclaimed themselves to all the world "free and independent States," and the Republic of the United States of America was formed.

These "free and independent States," in their "Articles of Confederation and Perpetuul Union," entered into a firm league of friendship with each other for, among other things, "the security of their liberties," binding themselves to assist each other against all force offered to, or attacks made upon them, or any of them, on account of religion, etc., thus showing that a "profound love of liberty" inspired them to act, that the security of their liberties was among the first cares of our revolutionary sires, and that religious liberty was not the least of the liberties involved in this great watcheare.

In the "Articles of Compact" between the original States and the people of the Northwestern Territory, as incorporated in the "Ordinance" for the government of that territory, there was an express provision that the people should not be molested in their religious sentiments or mode of worship, and these "Articles of Compact" were ordained and declared "for extending the principles of civil and religious liberty, which form the basis whereon these republics, their laws, and constitutions are erected; to fix and establish those principles as the basis of all laws, constitutions and governments, which forever hereafter shall be formed in said territory," etc., and these "Articles of Compact" were declared to "forever remain unalterable, unless by common consent." This was the beginning of the territorial system of the United States, showing that the inhabitants of the Territories, as a matter of course, had the same inalienable rights, guaranteed to them as well as to the inhabitants of the States, of religious liberty, and the pursuit of life, liberty and happiness.

In pursuance of this grand principle, the Constitution of the United States expressly provides that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." It is true that this provision is binding upon Congress, but not upon the various States. The provision is that "Congress shall make no law," etc., but the States are not therein forbidden to make a law of this kind. As the Cincinnati *Commercial* expresses it, "there is now nothing in the Constitution of the United States to prevent any single commonwealth, should it happen to be settled or colonized by a preponderant majority of any religious sect, whether Mormons, Catholics or Anabaptists, from so shaping the Constitution and laws of that State as to disfranchise, or otherwise discriminate against all citizens not affiliating with the prevalent religious belief." In times past some of the States have enacted and enforced laws bearing upon religious faith and practice, but such laws have not been in consonance with the fundamental principles of the Constitution, and are regarded now as things of a past age, and as the results or lingering remnants of the Old World policy of governments, restricting, regulating, or controling

religious matters, so that at the present time many or most, if not all, of the States have engrafted upon their constitutions this constitutional principle of liberty, whether or not expressed in the same identical words. In fact, theoretically at least, this principle of the liberty of the people is the one great central, salient, distinguishing feature of the American system of government, in express and emphatic and fundamental contradistinction to the common Old World practice of governments interfering with, regulating, and in a greater or less degree controling the religion of their subjects.

Thus, if Congress enacts a law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, Congress does an unconstitutional thing, and if a State enacts any such law, whether or not it violates its own constitution, it does violate the Declaration of Independence, and the great principle of religious liberty, which is one of the fundamental principles of the American system of popular government.

If Congress has no power to make a law concerning an establishment of religion, nor to prohibit the free exercise thereof, then it follows, as clear as can be, that any such law made by Congress is unconstitutional, and consequently is null and void, and ought to be so regarded and authoritatively declared in each and every instance.

Chief Justice White recognizes this provision of the Constitution and its binding force upon Congress, and declares that "it is of the very essence of American liberty that this right should be accorded in effect and in spirit by all and to all," and that "the reverse of it, persecution for opinion's sake, is the essence of tyranny."

This is all very good, so far as it goes, but the Judge continues and says that "there must be some limit to this high constitutional privilege," and that "parallel with and dominating over this is the obligation which every member of society owes to that society; that is, obedience to law." Dominating over what? What can dominate over a plain constitutional provision? The constitution and all constitutional laws are the "supreme law of the land." What "obedience to law" can dominate over the "supreme law of the land?" What obligation to society can dominate over that supreme law which guarantees the rights and privileges of every individual member of society, and the rights and privileges of society in the concrete? His honor appears to have got things a little mixed here. But it is excusable, as the questions before him were new and peculiar. However, we will proceed to unfold the mystery, to unravel the web, and to make the whole subject as plain as a pikestaff, so plain that the wayfaring man, though a fool, need not err therein.

The point which appears to have puzzled and somewhat mystified the Chief Justice, and which he failed to comprehend and consequently to present clearly, in his charge, is the obligation of members of society to society, or to each other, or, in other words, the limits of constitutional rights and privileges, the line of demarcation between the rights and privileges of one citizen and the rights and privileges of another citizen. We see no difficulty in this, but his honor evidently did, and his ideas of those limits or that line of demarcation seem extraordinary. The Constitution itself furnishes, as we think, the unmistakable landmarks which distinctly designate those limits, that line of demarcation, beyond dispute, when once seen and recognized. The Constitution guarantees to every citizen the right to the "free exercise" of his religion, whatever it may be, and therefore, per force, the exercise of no citizen's religion can be allowed if it is of a nature to deprive any other citizen of the same constitutional guarantees. That is the line. What can be plainer than this? If the Judge had seen this in its native simplicity, its inherent clearness, he would not have adopted such a weak mode of reasoning as he did, for he would have seen the inadequacy, the fallacy of that reasoning.

The Chief Justice presents the strange proposition that the limit of the constitutional guarantee of the free exercise of religion is the line between opinion and action, faith

and works, theory and practice. This is one of the strangest ideas conceivable. The Constitution says nothing of the kind. A religion that is all opinion, all faith, all theory, is no religion at all. It amounts to nothing whatever. It is nonsense to say that the Constitution guarantees freedom of religious opinion, of religious faith, of religious theory. Every man in every nation has that freedom, for the very good reason that no power on earth can hinder him, no earthly power can prevent him from thinking what he pleases, believing what he pleases, and theorizing as he pleases. The assertion that the framers of the Constitution did incorporate in it a provision guaranteeing a man rights and privileges which they could neither guarantee nor deny, is simply ridiculous. Not all the constitutions and congresses and governments on earth can hinder a man from having as many opinions, faiths, and theories as he pleases. They cannot effectually prescribe his faith, his opinions, his theories. In this he is entirely beyond their power, outside of their jurisdiction, and it seems weakness even to puerility to argue that any earthly constitution guarantees to a man rights and privileges of this kind.

If the Constitution guarantees to every citizen the right to the free exercise of his religion, which it certainly does, so far as Congress is concerned, then it guarantees no more to one citizen than it does to another, that very guarantee gives all men equal rights to the free exercise of their religion, unhindered by the religion of any other man. Hence, there needs no other law to dominate over this constitutional provision. Again, as to civil rights, if the Constitution guarantees to every citizen the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, so far as Congress is concerned, that very guarantee prevents one man, in such pursuit, from infringing upon the right of another man in the same pursuit. Then what necessity for any other law or obligation to dominate over the Constitution? We see none whatever. There is none, and there can be none.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY.

Salt Lake City, Dec. 15, 1875.

Editors Herald:

As no notice has been taken, by others, of the charge of Chief Justice White to the grand jury in the case of the United States *vs.* George Reynolds, and as it is a case of considerable interest to the citizens of this Territory, I take the liberty of submitting the following; not out of any captions or unkind feelings towards his honor, but to correct some ideas and statements which I consider erroneous, as applied to one of the most vital principles of religious faith and practice. There is something magnanimous and generous in his views respecting the free and untrammeled exercise of religious opinion and belief, and it is really as stated by his honor, "the very essence of American liberty that this right should be accorded, in *effect and in spirit, by all and to all.*" So far good—"But," he says, "gentlemen, there must be some limit to this high constitutional privilege, and you will observe that the Court has told you that in matters of opinion, and especially in matters of religious belief, all men are free. But parallel with and dominating over this is the obligation which every member of society owes to that society; that is obedience to the law. This great principle to which I have alluded must have its limits in practice, while so far as *opinion* is concerned, it is free—free as the air which we breathe."

Or in other words, you are free to have a religious *belief* or *opinion*, but not free to practice it. Where, then, is the freedom? It is simply a myth. It is the *free exercise* of religion that the Constitution guarantees. It is not simply an opinion or belief that is here referred to; but the worship, or act, springing from, growing out of, and originating from that opinion or belief. A man may

hold what opinions he pleases anywhere, and believe as he pleases in any country. It is the expression of those opinions and the carrying out of his belief that give offence and are opposed. Our Constitution guarantees something more than opinion and belief. It says — "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or *prohibiting the free exercise thereof.*" The Constitution permits the Jew to worship on Saturday, and the Christian on Sunday. It permits the Catholic to celebrate high mass, to burn incense and candles, to adore the image of Jesus, of Mary and of other Saints; and allows the Protestants to let it alone. It permits Christians to build meeting-houses and to worship in them. It permits the "Mormons" to build Tabernacles and Temples, and the Chinese joss houses. It permits monogamists to have one wife according to their religious belief, and "Mormons" more, according to their religious belief; or there is no meaning in the words, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the *free exercise thereof.*" Freedom of opinion and belief is nothing without the free exercise thereof.

It is the opinion of monogamists that marriage is proper. The Greek, the Roman Catholic, and I believe the Episcopalian church make it one of their sacraments. Now an opinion is nothing unless it is carried out and consummated; when it is, an act is performed, that act performed becomes *un fait accompli*, something more than religious faith, belief, or opinion; it is the actual uniting of one man with one woman — a marriage, a union; it is one of those "inalienable rights" which the Declaration of Independence asserts as being connected with the right of "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness;" it is more than opinion, it is the right to *pursue* and the liberty to *do*. Therefore when a monogamist of the above-named faith gets married, he exercises, or carries out freely his religious faith. Now the religious faith, belief, or opinion of George Reynolds, and of this people, on the marital question, is in a plurality of wives, as was abundantly proven before the Court, and which his honor the Chief Justice does not dispute. Why not have the free exercise of this religious faith? If the monogamist carries out his faith undisturbed, why not the polygamist? That provision of the Constitution is of no use to the former, if not to the latter.

But we are told by his honor that "there must be some limit." What is that limit? "The law;" he says, "but parallel with and *dominating over this* is the obligation which every member of society owes to that society; that is, obedience to law." Dominating over what? Over this high constitutional privilege? Free are we in matters of opinion and in matters of religious belief! Where are those glorious aspirations of liberty if this is the case? What becomes of constitutional religious freedom, if there is another dominating power, that is, law, which overrides the constitutional guarantees? His honor, of course, finds this law, for which he is not responsible; but that law takes us back to the law makers; for without them we should not have had this law. Therefore, if the law is this dominating power, the framers of that law are also a dominating power; for they furnish the power. Congress therefore, being the originators of this great dominant power, or law, have found out a method to violate constitutional guarantees, and of making laws prohibiting the *free exercise of religion*, and courts can, of course, carry it out, as these laws *dominate over all*. This is the legitimate sequence of such reasoning; and our Constitution is a myth.

His honor next informs us that there are religious errors in India; and refers to the "Hindoo mother casting her infant into the Ganges, as a religious duty," to the "Fiji leading his helpless parent to the wood to perish or to be devoured by wild beasts," and then refers to the "burning of widows in India." These are old statements presented in Congress, and referred to by his excellency ex-Vice President Colfax in a controversy on this point. I therefore quote from my remarks to that distinguished gentleman: —

"To present Mr. Colfax's argument fairly, it stands thus — The burning of Hindoo widows was considered a religious rite by the Hindoos. The British were horrified at the practice and suppressed it. The 'Mormons' believe polygamy to be a religious rite. The American nation consider it a scandal, and that they ought to put it down. Without entering into all the details, I think the above a fair statement of the question. He says, 'The claim that religious faith commanded it was powerless and it went down as a relic of barbarism.' He says, 'History tells us what a civilized nation, akin to ours, actually did where they had the power.' I wish to treat this argument with candor. * * * The British suppressed the suttee in India, and therefore we must be equally moral and suppress polygamy in the United States. Hold! Not so fast; let us state facts as they are and remove the dust. The British suppressed the suttee, but tolerate eighty-three millions of polygamists in India. If the British are indeed to be our exemplars, Congress had better wait until polygamy is suppressed in India. But it is absurd to compare the suttee to polygamy; one is murder, and the destruction of life; the other is national economy and the increase and perpetuation of life. Suttee ranks truly with *infanticide*, both of which are destructive of human life. *Polygamy* is salvation compared with either, and tends, even more than monogamy, to increase and perpetuate the human race." (P. 23. Reply to Colfax, by John Taylor).

In speaking of the suttee, throwing children into the Ganges, &c., his honor remarks, "Could these things be allowed in this country?" Yes, if they were fashionable. There are thousands of infants sacrificed in this country, and scarcely any notice taken of it, and that by our most fashionable ladies, assisted by their husbands, pimps and paramours; and what is done with the murderers of these innocents? An unfortunate is sometimes pounced upon, and a great hue and cry made about it; but that is the exception. What of the thousands who are no less guilty, who pass unpunished? We wink at this foul, seething, crying infamy, not because it is religious, but because it panders to our vice and crime. This fashionable murder of children, this heartless, damning, bloody crime is so frequent that we take no notice of it, but honorable marriage according to the law of God, both ancient and modern, is sought to be made a crime of both by legislators and jurists, while in many instances themselves are steeped in vice and reeking with infamy.

It is not out of any discourtesy to our Chief Justice that I make these remarks, nor do I wish to accuse of evil intent. The law is made for and not by him. If this opinion had not been published I should not have noticed it; but being published, as one of the guardians of society, I deem it a duty to unravel some of its sophisms lest our youths and men not conversant with such affairs might be perverted by an apparently plausible statement.

Respectfully,

JOHN TAYLOR.

—*Salt Lake Herald.*

IS GREEN TEA A POISON?

A new law, entitled the Sale of Food and Drugs Act, goes into force in England next New Year's day. The Commissioners of Customs are given extraordinary powers by it in regard to the stoppage of imports of adulterated edible goods. A remarkable correspondence between the Commissioners and a firm of London tea-merchants has recently been published, much to the horror of the devotees of the cup that cheers. The firm inquired whether the Commissioners meant to confiscate all adulterated tea after Jan. 1, and explained that such a course would put a summary stop to the supply of green tea, inasmuch as every particle of that tea is "faced."

"Faced" is a pleasing paraphrase for "adulterated." Since this rather startling disclosure the London *Times* has published a number of letters *pro* and *con*. The upshot of the discussion has been to re-establish the facts which the *Tribune* laid before the public some years ago, when was exposed the poisonous humbug sold and drank as green tea.

Black tea is the leaf in its natural state. Most of the varieties are, however, too mild to satisfy a palate used to pickles and mustard and pepper sauces, and like condiments. The dealers, therefore, kindly poison the leaf, and produce what they are pleased to advertize as "a superior quality of green tea." At one time ten pounds of green tea were sold in the American market for every pound imported. The process of adulteration was performed at the seaboard. A long cylinder, turning slowly over a fire, was half filled with black tea. Then handfuls of turmeric, indigo and other poisonous matter was thrown in. After the whole had been cooked together the stuff came out as green tea. Each leaf was perhaps coated with copper! Since then "Chinese cheap labor" has supplanted Caucasian cunning. The Mongolian ships the tea already greened, and so saves the importer the trouble. The change, however, is a bad one for the consumer. The almond-eyed heathen have surpassed their Christian teachers in the art of adulteration. A member of a Manchester tea firm writes to the London *Times* that the coloring matter used is a "filthy compound" of silicate of magnesium, Prussian blue "and other dirt," and that the leaves colored are faded and old, and mixed with leaves of a plant bearing the suggestive name of "lie tea."

The "lie tea," we may add, flourishes in New Jersey, and is carefully cultivated there—it is not difficult to surmise why.

There is such a thing as pure green tea, but it is much weaker than the artificial stuff, and has to be prepared by a process that is long and costly. It is rarely exported from China.

Recent reformers have argued that excessive tea-drinking does as much harm to women as excessive consumption of alcohol does to men. The comparison of the two may be [illegible] exaggeration, but it is not to be de[illegible] that tea has many victims, and that they one and all prefer it in its poisoned state. Their tastes crave the acid twang of copper and other poisons. There are many women who constantly do what Thackeray makes one of his snobs do—"commit dangerous excesses on green tea." She who is wise and wants to be healthy, will find the abjuration of striped stockings, green wall-paper and green tea more efficacious than getting up with the sun.—*Chicago Tribune, Dec.* 1875.

Bishop Temple on Apostolic Succession.—The Bishop of Exeter, having been interrogated by a foreign ecclesiastical dignitary as to whether apostolic succession is a doctrine of the Church of England, has replied as follows:—"The Church of England desires to include within her pale both those who hold the doctrine of the apostolic succession and those who do not. To meet the need of the latter she nowhere requires any of her members or ministers to hold that doctrine. To meet the need of the former she provides that all her ministers shall profess that succession as a fact."

The Dangers of Cleanliness.—What with doctors and sanitarians the man of the nineteenth century bids fair to be driven into a state of primitive savagism. Whatever we eat or drink somebody enjoins us to avoid, and now the physicians of New York have "concluded" that a terrible amount of disease is occasioned by the use of soap. Not only, we are told, has the diptheria prevalent amongst washerwomen been traced to impurity in this popular detergent, but lung fever and kidney diseases in adults and many other complaints in children. The cause suggested is the impure condition of the fats used in the manufacture; and toilet soaps, in which the impurity may be masked by perfumes, are reported to be the worst. It would be well that our analysts should turn their attention to this matter, if that which is popularly regarded as a chief agent in promoting health has really become an important source of disease.—*Iron.*

THE LATTER-DAY SAINTS' MILLENNIAL STAR.

MONDAY, JANUARY 31, 1876.

EXERCISE OF RELIGION.

THOMAS Carlyle says, "Conviction is worthless till it converts itself into conduct." This is equally true of spiritual as of temporal affairs. St. James says, "Faith without works is dead," and Jesus says, "Not every one that saith unto me Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven." Those three declarations pertinently point at the worthlessness of belief, faith, and conviction in and of themselves. They broadly distinguish betwixt what we call "faith" as the mover of our actions and the actions themselves. The latter may be meritorious, while the former, of itself, is dead or worthless. The farmer who does not sow, does not reasonably expect to reap; nor should men look for salvation who work not the works of righteousness. The popular doctrine of "Justification by faith," is not a Scriptural doctrine—it is a heresy. Mankind are justified in the sight of God only by their good works. In view of this latter fact, we look for salvation and exaltation in the degree that we keep the commandments of God.

It is therefore the *exercise* of our religion that constitutes the essence of it. Hence the believer, if given to sin, first reforms his conduct that he may become eligible for baptism; he is baptized in order to have a remission of sins; he receives the imposition of hands for the gift of the Holy Ghost; he frequently partakes of bread and wine in token of his belief; he forsakes home and kindred to prove his integrity, and gathers to Zion to receive certain sacred ordinances and help build up the kingdom of God; and he further observes to do the revealed will of the Father in order to sanctify his affections, to grow in knowledge, to be perfected through suffering, and, eventually, to be exalted with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob and all the righteous.

Those are the terms upon which the Saints look for eternal life, and, no matter how sincere our faith or how fervent our convictions, we must fall proportionately short of it as we wilfully or negligently fall short in our conduct. Without observing the commandments of God we cannot be made perfect; without gathering we cannot receive our sacred ordinances; without baptism there is no remission of sins; and without remission of sins we cannot even enter the kingdom of God. A mere profession of articles of faith therefore will avail us nothing.

In commenting on the Reynolds plural marriage case, a prominent newspaper in the United States affirms the doctrine that "civil law controls external conduct, though not articles of faith, and renders every man amenable for his acts to the legal penalties, despite church or creed." If that be a correct doctrine, then the United States civil law controls baptism for the remission of sins; the imposition of hands for the gift of the Holy Ghost; and the ordinance of the Lord's supper as well as the ordinance of marriage, and religious liberty in the United States is a myth, and their Constitution a nonentity.

But the doctrine is incorrect. Civil law in the United States is subordinate to the Constitution which is the supreme law, and which prescribes that Congress shall make no law prohibiting the free exercise of religion. We do not deny that men are amenable for their acts to the civil law, but we deny the right of the civil law to transcend the limits of the authority prescribed for it by its Constitution.

As alleged by an able writer, "religion is the basis upon which civil government rests—that from which power derives its authority, laws their efficacy, and both their sanction." Among Christians the Holy Bible is the standard of religion, and is, therefore, the proper umpire in all religious questions. What the Bible upholds and sustains cannot rightfully be denounced as a crime by Christian legislators. That it does uphold and sustain plural marriage every Bible student knows. The learned Dr. Channing in his article on Milton, says—"We believe it to be an indisputable fact that although Christianity was first preached in Asia, which had been from the earliest ages the seat of polygamy, the Apostles never denounced it as a crime, and never required their converts to put away all wives but one."

The great Milton asks—"On what grounds can a practice be considered dishonorable which is prohibited to no one even under the Gospel? Reverence for so many Patriarchs who were polygamists, will, I trust, deter any one from considering polygamy as fornication or adultery; for whoremongers and adulterers God will adjudge, whereas the Patriarchs were the objects of his especial favor, as he himself testifies. Let the rule received among theologians have the same weight here as in other cases—'The practice of the Saints is the best interpretation of the commandments.'"

At the period of the reformation in Germany, during the early part of the 16th century, those great reformers, Luther, Melancthon, Zwingli and Bucer, held a solemn consultation at Wittenberg on the question—"Whether it is contrary to the divine law for a man to have two wives at once?" and decided unanimously that it was not, and upon the authority of this decision, Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, actually married a second wife, his first being still alive. This fact is recorded in D'Aubigne's History of the Reformation and by other authors of that period.

The civil law of the United States can never rightfully abolish baptism for the remission of sins without first obtaining a power it does not now possess, yet baptism is not an "article of faith," it is a matter of external conduct. It has not yet proceeded against baptism for the remission of sins, the Lord's supper, and the observance of other sacraments, and ordinances, but if we cede to the civil law the right to suppress plural marriage, we cede an equal right to suppress every other sacrament and ordinance that has been, or may be, revealed to the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

It is alleged that the civil law tolerates baptism, the imposition of hands, the Lord's supper, and other sacraments and ordinances, for the primary reasons, that they are taught in the Holy Scriptures and their observance is not inimical to the interests of society, while, on the other hand, the law denounces plural marriage as being opposed to the Scriptures and the interests of society. Upon these points, as regards plural marriage, we have always been willing and anxious to join issue. Much upon both points has appeared from time to time in the columns of the STAR and other Church periodicals. The Scriptures speak for themselves, and surely the society concerned in the premises may be suffered to speak for itself. That society—particularly the female portion—has repeatedly memorialized Congress, respectfully protesting against legislative interference in this very matter of plural marriage—and now, as appears in another column, two petitions are before Congress signed by 23,360 "Mormon" women asking that Utah be given a State government, and that the anti-polygamy law and the Poland law be repealed—laws framed expressly to empower Federal Courts in Utah to suppress plural marriage.

We firmly and uncompromisingly avow our faith in the doctrine of plural marriage as God's revelation. That which God approves cannot be evil; and that which practically abolishes adultery, seduction, fornication and prostitution cannot rightly be called a crime, nor opposed to the interests of society, but on the contrary, it is the most needed, greatest reform of the age.

Let us do our duty and God will vindicate the right.

D. McK.

CARD TO THE SAINTS IN SCOTLAND.—Having been called to labor in the Liverpool Office, without the opportunity of paying you a farewell visit, the Editor has kindly given me space in this number to say "good-by" to you, a privilege which I gladly accept.

On July 30, 1874, I arrived in your midst and succeeded Elder W. N. Fife as President of the Glasgow Conference. From that time until Jan. 20, 1876, my labors have been almost exclusively with you, during which I have made very many agreeable acquaintances and a number of friends. Altogether, it is a period the memory of which I shall long cherish. For your many kindnesses to me I thank you most heartily, and earnestly pray that God may reward you. Let me exhort you to garner up the good teachings you have received from the brethren and apply them in your lives, so shall you become Saints.

I bid you, one and all, a most affectionate farewell, with the earnest hope that we shall neither falter in our faith, nor slacken in our diligence, until we can strike hands together in Zion as faithful followers of Christ Jesus.

42, Islington, Liverpool. DAVID MCKENZIE.

CORRESPONDENCE.

—o—

AMERICA.

President's Office,
Salt Lake City, U. T.,
Dec. 28th, 1875.

Pres. Albert Carrington.

Dear Brother,—Your pleasant favor of 4th inst., with its items of varied news, reached here in due course, gratifying us with the assurance of the continued faithfulness of the Elders and Saints in the British Mission, and of your own good health and prosperity. I could have wished that the brethren

lately returning home had done so under more auspicious circumstances and with brighter feelings, for none of us will receive blessings for duties unperformed, or callings unfulfilled.

The news that we receive from the Elders on their way to fill their mission to Mexico is very cheering. When last heard from they were leaving Tucson, in the southern portion of Arizona. They had originally intended to enter Mexico by Sonora, but the breaking out in that State of one of those chronic revolutions, for which Mexico is so notorious, led them to choose a more easterly course, which would lead them through the country of Cochise's tribe of Apaches, and to this wild and savage race they intended, if possible, to preach the Gospel, and from there enter Mexico by Chihuahua. They had already preached to the Pimás, Maricopas, and other tribes who dwell in the region of the Gila river, and their words have been received with much interest by the Indians, who are anxious for the brethren to settle amongst them and teach them the history of their forefathers. The citizens of Arizona were also more than willing that settlements of the Saints should be formed in that Territory. Gov. Safford is also favorable to that idea, and by his invitation some of the Elders preached at the Court-house in Tucson. Much of the country is represented by the brethren as being well watered and timbered, and with some of the finest grazing lands on the Continent.

On Friday last myself, Elders John Taylor, Joseph F. Smith, and other Elders, met with the Priesthood of Davis County, at Farmington, when, by the request of the brethren, we appointed a President to take charge of the interests of the people in that section, as the Saints there think that their material and spiritual interests will be advanced and benefited by such an appointment. Elder Joseph F. Smith was appointed to fill the position, though his duties in the Endowment House, &c., will require him to spend a portion of his time in this city.

In a few days, 1875 will be numbered with the mighty past. It has been a year that will be remembered by many as a year of storms, of hurricanes, of the sea heaving itself beyond its bounds, and of shipwrecks and disasters on the ocean. To the Latter-day Saints it has been a year of progress and peace. It would be difficult for our enemies to point out the place where they have accomplished any of their unholy desires; all their persistent efforts and zealous labors have resulted in nothing more than the annoyance of a few of our brethren for righteousness' sake; in every other respect they have signally failed in all their unscrupulous warfare against the people of the Most High. On the other hand we can behold around us in Zion a marked increase of faith and good works amongst the Saints, and the close of the year is characterized by a greater spirit of unity and determination to do God's will by the people than marked its advent; whilst the reports that reach us on every hand from the missionaries now spread over this continent, speak of a time of such general inquiry with regard to the principles of the Gospel and willingness to listen to the teachings of the Elders, as has not been witnessed for many a year past. So also among the Lamanites, the desire and feeling to unite their interests and lives with those of the Saints is gradually, visibly and surely increasing, and the work of the Father has evidently began, and is rapidly gaining strength in their hearts.

The interest manifested in the preaching of the Elders, especially in the Western States, with the many openings presented for their ministrations, even more than those now laboring in those regions could fill, has led us to call Elders Claudius V. Spencer and Joseph E. Taylor to take a mission to Council Bluffs and neighborhood, where there is a splendid opportunity to do good. Elders Junius F. Wells and Joseph F. Simmons have been laboring there with very encouraging prospects, but have now gone farther east, and the reports were so favorable for an increase to the Church in that region that we deemed it wise to send these brethren to continue the work so encouragingly opened by Elders Wells and Simmons. We also intend to soon send some Elders to-

Oregon, from whence we receive appeals for instruction in the principles of the Everlasting Gospel.

Brother George Reynolds has again been tried, convicted and sentenced for his obedience to the law of Celestial Marriage. The Judge possibly thought it his business to secure a conviction. The case will be appealed to the Supreme Court of the Territory, and come up at its June term. There were so many peculiarities incidental to or dragged into the trial that there is quite a probability that the indictmen may be quashed by that court.

The holidays are passing very quietly. The weather during the past few days has been mild, with much rain and a little snow; but reports reach us of very severe storms on the mountains, and of snow slides in the cañons, one of which in Little Cottonwood proved fatal to three miners on Christmas day.

Remember me most kindly to Ernest, to Arta D., to brother James Sharp, and to the Elders laboring in the ministry.

May every blessing needful for you to fulfil the responsible duties of your calling, and enhance your own happiness, be yours, is the prayer of your brother in the Gospel,

BRIGHAM YOUNG.

Nashville, Washington County,
Illinois,
Jan. 6, 1876.

Prest. Albert Carrington.

Dear Brother,—Knowing that your interest in the Elders on missions is not limited to those in Europe, I feel prompted to write to you. I left home Nov. 1st, 1875, to perform a mission in the United States, to which I was unexpectedly called last Conference. My design was to proceed directly to this State, Illinois, and commence operations among my mother's kindred. I was, however, through a providential opening for missionary labor, detained in Iowa, on the frontiers, for a month, during which time my companions, brothers Joseph F. Simmons and Joseph G. Young and I held some fifteen meetings, the people thronging the schoolhouses which were opened for us, and paying excellent attention to our instructions.

I left those brethren there, and continued my journey by way of St. Louis, holding meetings in Missouri, on the way to this place, where I have had opportunity to address the public several times, and have made many acquaintances and friends. My presence here has so much annoyed the Presbyterian and Methodist ministers, that they have publicly denounced the Prophet and the Saints, and warned their congregations against entertaining "these who are at present in our midst." This has caused considerable commotion here, and is leading many to investigate. Wherein our people are defamed by the remarks of these men, I have replied to them in the newspapers, the editors of which are very friendly. In our meetings my course has been to pay no regard to them whatever, but to warn, and testify to the truth. I feel that the Lord is with me, and that a good work may be done here. My desires are to labor zealously for the truth in the field to which I am called.

It seems, from letters I have received, that all the Elders who were appointed to the States have been able to prosecute their labors under peculiar advantages, having halls opened to them, favorable newspaper notices, and friends to entertain them. Thus the Work is progressing, and the Lord is at work with His people, and the Saints everywhere have great reason to be encouraged and strengthened in their most holy faith.

I am often reminded, in my labors here, of my happy experience while traveling in England; and many times the recollection of scenes and persons, and particularly of the blessings of the Lord upon me while there, encourages me in my present labors, and teaches me how to perform my mission to the best advantage. I shall appreciate a kindly remembrance to all of the Saints who know me, and pray that I may meet them, with all the faithful, in the mountains of Zion, in the due time of the Lord.

Please remember me to all of the brethren, and to Mr. Ramsden, and particularly to sister Carrington and her two sons with you.

Letters will reach me, if directed to 2006, North 14th Street, St. Louis, Missouri.

Praying the Lord to bless you always, I remain your brother in the Gospel,

JUNIUS F. WELLS.

HOLLAND.

Zwolle, Jan. 5, 1876.

Prest. A. Carrington.

Dear Brother,—It is with pleasure that I write you a few lines about the affairs and condition of the Holland Mission. There are a few faithful Saints in Holland; they are feeling well, and are trying to live to the requirements of heaven.

As the year is new, so I feel renewed in my spirit to do some good this year and to open some new fields, with the help of the Lord. In the last few weeks I have become acquainted with some gentlemen who are examining our principles. I have sent one the "Book of Mormon," and expect to write to him this week, and send him the "Key to Theology." In speaking with him about polygamy, the topic of the day, he said that polygamy was practiced by many holy men anciently, and was instituted by Jehovah.

The editors are helping me by making known that a "Mormon" Elder is in the land; the sound of the Gospel is to go through all lands for a witness, and then shall the end come. Sometimes I have the privilege of speaking in canal boats or in steamers, by the wayside, and in private houses.

God bless all who are laboring for the kingdom of our Lord, that we may bring many souls unto Christ. Kind love to you and all in the Office.

Asking an interest in your faith and prayers, I remain obediently, your brother in the everlasting Covenant of Peace,

P. J. LAMMERS.

UTAH NEWS.

The Supreme Court of Utah Territory was to have convened on Monday, Jan. 10th.

From the *Deseret News*:—

JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED.—This morning, (Dec. 21st,) the defendant in the case of the United States *vs.* George Reynolds, convicted of bigamy, appeared in court to receive its judgment. The question of admitting the defendant to bail pending an appeal to the Supreme Court was argued by the respective attorneys, the points and authorities in favor of the admission to bail of the defendant adduced by Mr. Rawlings being most plain and conclusive. After hearing the arguments, the Court signified its intention of granting bail, being now convinced that the law authorized it. The judgment of the Court was subsequently pronounced, which was, that the defendant be confined, at hard labor, in the Detroit House of Correction, at Detroit, Michigan, for the term of two years, and that he pay a fine of five hundred dollars to the United States. The amount of bail was fixed at $10,000, for which Hon. W. Hooper and Hiram B. Clawson, Esq., became sureties, and Mr. Reynolds was set at liberty. It is expected the case will come up, on appeal, in the Supreme Court of the Territory in February, at the next session of that court. In pronouncing sentence the Court remarked that, in doing so, it would consider the recommendation of the defendant by the jury to the mercy of the Court, but the severity of the penalty inflicted indicates that the Court's ideas of clemency may possibly differ materially from those entertained by most people. The outside limit prescribed by the law in cases of this kind is imprisonment for five years and a fine of five hundred dollars, there being no prescribed inside or lower limit, that being left to the discretion of the judge.

THE LAMANITES.—This morning (Jan. 7) we had a pleasant visit from Hon. A. K. Thurber, representative to the Legislature from Sanpete and Sevier Counties. From him we gather some information concerning matters in the South. The Lamanites of Grass Valley raised about one hundred and fifty

bushels of wheat last season, and their disposition as regards a desire to ramble about from place to place appears to have undergone a complete revolution, their attention being now absorbed in settling down, making farms, and desiring to erect and inhabit buildings. Kanosh and some other Indians from different parts of the Territory, and some from Nevada, are on a visit there. Brother Thurber held a meeting with the Indians of Grass Valley, about a week ago, on which occasion Kanosh delivered a discourse, in which he told how Lehi, the great progenitor of the Lamanites, came over the great waters, with his family, to this land, how they increased and spread abroad, how the Lord poured out his blessings upon them when they were good, and how they were chastised when they did wrong, and he exhorted those Lamanites who were listening to him to do right, that they also might be prospered, according to the predictions of their fathers.

About Dancing.—In a conversation in the President's Office, Dec. 4th, 1875, with Bishops Layton and Smith, on the subject of dancing, President Young said that it was his mind that dances should commence from one to two in the afternoon, and dismiss from nine to ten. That was the plan he had adopted in this city in the early days of the Territory, and which he wished to see adopted by the Bishops in the settlements. He had led out in this way himself from the commencement of the settlement of the Territory, and set the example in his own practice, and his mind was still unchanged. Dancing was no part of our religion, but when we attended to it for our amusement, we did it in the name of the Lord, just as we should attend to any other business. With regard to round dances, he was opposed to them, from beginning to end, from top to bottom. Round dances were first commenced in and still continue brothel-house dances.

George Reynolds,
(Clerk to Prest. Young).

I endorse the above statement.

(Signed) Brigham Young.

From the *Salt Lake Herald*:—

Street Car Extension.—The citizens of the east and southeast portions of the city are circulating a petition for the extension of the lower line of the street car track to their part of the city. "Your cause is just," and we believe the directors of the company will give a willing ear to the petition and meet the wants of our growing city. The traffic will be increased and everybody concerned be made happy.

Long, Loud Words.—A Washington dispatch says that W. C. Staines, Esq., Church Emigration agent, had arrived at the capital with two petitions signed by 23,360 Mormon women, asking that Utah be given a State government, and that the anti-polygamy law and the Poland law be repealed. The petitions are said to be each 17 yards in length.

From the *Ogden Junction*:—

Deseret Bank.—The Deseret National Bank was opened yesterday, (Jan. 3) in the new and elegant building which has been erected on the site of the old establishment, in which this solid financial firm built up its first-class reputation in the mercantile world. The new building has the finest appearance of any business house at Salt Lake, and is just the kind of place for Utah's chief banking institution.

Good Paper.—The *Woman's Exponent* for Jan. 1st is received. Always good, this excellent paper improves with age, and should increase in popularity. We commend it to the patronage and perusal of all our lady friends. It should have a place in every "Mormon" home.

The Ring.—Who has not heard of the Salt Lake ring? But who can tell what it is, where it is, and how it is at the close of the year of grace, 1875? It is broken, divided, smashed, and the chief fragments are scattered. Woods,

McKean, Gould, Toohy, Beadle, Wickizer, and Maxwell all gone, and not enough left of the circular combination if all rolled together to count 1. Good for 1875! It has been a year of retribution, and has brought confusion and shame to the rascals of the ring.

On Sunday evening, Dec. 26th, 1875, the Handel and Haydn Society of this city gave an entertainment at the Theatre of the Oratorio of the Messiah. The house was tolerably well filled, and, considering most of the singers were amateurs, it was decidedly a success. In consequence of the indisposition of Mrs. E. C. Haydon, one of the most talented singers, the rendering was not complete, as all her solos had to be omitted; but Mrs. Careless' rendering of her solos was exquisitely perfect.—*Woman's Exponent.*

From the *Salt Lake Daily Times* we learn that the resident members of the Dramatic Company have formed themselves into an organization called the SALT LAKE DRAMATIC COMBINATION, with a view of giving semi-weekly performances at the Salt Lake Theatre, commenced Jan. 8th, with Tom Taylor's play, *The Outcast*, and the farce *Area Belle*.

VARIETIES.

The man who is curious to see how the world could get along without him, can see by sticking a cambric needle into a mill pond, and then withdrawing it and looking at the hole.

DON'T SCOLD.—For the sake of your children, don't do it. It is a great misfortune to have children reared in the presence of a scold. The effect of the everlasting complaining and fault-finding of such persons is to make the young who hear it unamiable, malicious, callous-hearted, and they often take pleasure in doing the very things for which they receive such tongue lashings. As they are always getting the blame of wrong doing, whether they deserve it or not, they think they might as well do wrong as right. They lose all ambition to strive for the favorable opinion of the fault-finder, since they see they always strive in vain. Thus a scold is not only a nuisance, but a destroyer of the morals of children.

THE FORCE OF HABIT.—At a camp meeting last summer a venerable sister began the hymn—

"My soul, be on thy guard;
Ten thousand foes arise."

She began in shrill quavers, but it was pitched too high—"Ten thousand—Ten thousand"—she screeched and stopped. "Start her at 5,000!" cried a converted stockbroker present.

POPULATION OF THE UNITED STATES.—The census taken in 1870 serves but a poor guide to the population of the country at the present time. That document, including the Territories, gave the number at 38,558,371. Since 1870 a census has been taken in fifteen of the States, in which it is found the increase since 1870, has been about 2,000,000. These fifteen States had, in 1870, something over one-third of the population of the United States, from which it is estimated that the entire aggregate increase has been about 5,000,000. The total is often referred to as at from 44,000,000 to 45,000,000, and probably the last-named figure is none too high, all the facts analyzed and properly considered.

"I saw an excellent thing in your pamphlet," said Daniel O'Connell to a young writer. "Eh? What sir?" was the rejoinder. "A penny bun, my friend."